

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1 – 16 are pending in the application.

In the present amendment, claims 1, 2 and 7 are amended. No new matter is added.

The Office Action objects to the drawings. In the present amendment, the drawings are amended to obviate this objection. Withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

The Office Action objects to claim 2. Claim 2 is amended to obviate this objection. Withdrawal of the objection to claim 2 is respectfully requested.

### **35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

The Office Action rejects claims 1 – 8, 13 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Mishelevich et al. (WO 01/31634, hereinafter Mishelevich).

Applicants submit that for at least the following reasons, claims 1 – 8, 13 and 14 are patentable over Mishelevich.

For example, claim 1, in part, requires:

*"wherein the correction device has a lexicon of alternatives which contains word parts, words and word sequences that can be displayed by the correction device as alternatives to individual word parts, words and word sequences of the recognized text."* (Emphasis added)

Applicants submit that Mishelevich does not disclose or otherwise suggest the above claimed feature.

In the Office Action, page 3, the Office argues that the claim does not rule out whole words. Although the claim does not rule out whole words, it does require the lexicon of alternatives to contain word parts. In order for a reference to anticipate a claim the MPEP 2131 requires the reference to teach each and every element of that claim. It is respectfully submitted that Mishelevich does not teach or suggest that the lexicon of alternatives contains word parts, as claimed.

Mishelevich, page 15, lines 21 – 28, discloses only the use of a word or a phrase in its application alternatives, but not word parts. Apparently, there is no discussion in Mishelevich that teaches the use of word parts in the lexicon of alternatives. Mishelevich, Fig. 10, shows that the word “damage” is being offered as an alternative to “damning” by having the word “damning” highlighted in box 1002, and the word “damage” listed in box 1012. However, contrary to the assertion made by the Office Action, page 5, nothing in Fig. 10 teaches or suggests that the word part “age” is being offered as an alternative to the word part “ning”. In Fig. 10, box 1002, Mishelevich does not show that the word part “ning” is highlighted but instead the whole word “damning” is highlighted; and in box 1012, Mishelevich does not show that the word part “age” is listed but instead the whole word “damage” is listed. Therefore, Mishelevich fails to disclose the claimed feature: wherein the correction device has a lexicon of alternatives which contains word parts, words and word sequences that can be displayed by the correction device as alternatives to individual word parts, words and word sequences of the recognized text.

In view of at least the foregoing, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over Mishelevich.

Similarly, claim 2, in part, requires:

*“lexicon of alternatives contains word parts, words and word sequences that can be displayed by the correction device as alternatives to individual word parts, words and word sequences of the recognized text.”*

In addition, claim 7, in part, requires:

*“including word parts, words and word sequences that can be confused with one another.”*

Since both independent claims 2 and 7 requires a lexicon of alternatives that includes word parts, and, as discussed above for claim 1, Mishelevich does not teach the use of word parts in the lexicon of alternatives, consequently, claims 2 and 7 are also patentable over Mishelevich.

Claims 3 – 6, 8, 13 and 14 are patentable because at least they respectfully depend from claims 2 and 7, with each claim containing further distinguishing features. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 – 8, 13 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully requested.

**35 U.S.C. §103(a)**


Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Office rejects claims 9 and 10 over Mishelevich in view of Ortega et al. (6,507,816); claim 11 over Mishelevich in view of Nassif et al. (6,418,410); claim 12 over Mishelevich in view of Chen et al. (5,864,805); claim 15 over Mishelevich in view of Ortega et al. (6,332,122); and claim 16 over Mishelevich in view of Rozak et al. (5,950,160).

Applicants further submit that none of the cited secondary references does in any way cure the defects present in Mishelevich as discussed above. Therefore, claims 9 – 12, 15 and 16 are patentable because at least they depend from claim 7, with each claim containing further distinguishing features. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9 – 12, 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all the claims pending in this patent application are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of all the claims are respectfully solicited.

In the event there are any errors with respect to the fees for this response or any other papers related to this response, the Director is hereby given permission to charge any shortages and credit any overcharges of any fees required for this submission to Deposit Account No. 14-1270.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to be 'Harris A. Wolin', written over a horizontal line.

By: Harris A. Wolin  
Registration No.: 39,432

For: Yan Glickberg  
Registration No.: 51,742

Phone: (440) 483-3455

**Please direct all correspondence to:**

Corporate Counsel  
U.S. PHILIPS CORPORATION  
P.O. Box 3001  
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001